Chapter

"What is Not News "

Because the Post, with unprecedented space and attention and the making of an assassination sensation, did publish the La Fontaines' variant of super-market tabloid journalism, a few illustrations of what it did not publish, and not it alone, what it did not consider worthy of publication in either commentary or as news, may serve to make the point that the major media will if infrequently get down to the level of The National Enquirer, it and the rest of the media have nothing to do with what by traditional standards was assassination and assassination-related news. The illustrations I use are from my FOIA litigation because all the evidence in those cases was subject to official denial and disproof if not truthful, fair and correct, and because it was all public, in open court.

When the Congress amending the FOIA in 1974, it cited as I report above my first FOIA lawsuit for the withheld results of the FBI's scientific testing in the JFK assassination as establishing the need to amend the investigatory files exemption, that was not news. No paper mentioned it, nor did radio or TV news. Not even when it was the sole surviving Kennedy brother who saw to it that the legislative history would be clear on this. That was never mentioned, to the best of knowledge, that alone by traditional news standards was unusual news. Reporters were in The Senate Press Gallery and they and their editors do get second quote The Congressional Record (May 30, 1974, page 5).

When a judge threatened my lawyer and me -- and they were all judges of the Federal district

court for the District of Columbia -- after I proved that the FBI had sworn falsely to him, swore falsely to what was most material in that litigation and hence was the felony of perjury, that got no mention anywhere. That was first in Civil Action 75-0226 and the judge was John H. Pratt. The FBI ~~special~~ Laboratory agent who swore falsely was John Kilty.

In that lawsuit I obtained not from the FBI but from the Energy Research and Development Agency, then successor to the Atomic Energy Commission, the results of the neutron activation testing of the ballistics and ballistic-related evidence which the FBI had suppressed beginning with all knowledge of those tests for it in 1964. The testing of the paraffin casts made by the Dallas police of Oswald's face, which showed none of the deposits required to be there after firing a rifle, proved that he had not because those others who fired that rifle, in those secret tests, with similar casts made and tested, all had those deposits on their faces. That the government's own evidence proved its assassination mythology to be just that and that having known the truth all along the government still reported and insisted that an innocent man had been the lone assassin was not newsworthy. Not even after I published it ~~later that year~~ in 1975 in Post Mortem.

When I persisted despite Pratt's threat and proved that Kilty was a perjurer, a felon, the Department of Justice, which represented the FBI, told Pratt that I "could make such claims (an unusual description of statements under oath and subject to perjury charges if untrue) ad infinitum since he (meaning me) is perhaps more familiar with the events surrounding the investigation of President Kennedy's assassination than anyone now employed by the FBI." Pratt accepted that as a refutation of or defense against my sworn-to statements that Kilty had perjured himself. This was not news, neither the proven charge nor such an irrelevancy as a court-accepted defense of a perjury charge.

Nor was it newsworthy that another FBI agent was accused in another court of being another FBI felon in that federal court.

In that lawsuit, C.A. 75-1996, which was for information relating to the assassination of Martin Luther King, Jr., I proved that the FBI's then case agent in that lawsuit, Horace Beckwith, not only swore falsely, again perjury, but also that the FBI had kept secret from that judge, June Geen, that Beckwith was an unindicted co-conspirator in a sensational case of that day, against the FBI's former acting director, Pat Gray, and several of his top assistants. When Beckwith sat mutely in front of her, Judge Green made no reference to either the charges I had made against Beckwith and the FBI and Department of Justice, which was the FBI's counsel and actually used Beckwith as its main witness. She merely banished Beckwith from her court and, without a word, he just got up and left.

That the Department and the FBI would dare use as a witness an unindicted co-conspirator in a major criminal prosecution, a man who was so vulnerable and so beholden to them he had to do their bidding without question lest he risk being indicted, ~~and his pension~~ lose his pension he would get in two years, was not worth any mention by the media. Nor was it that I had again proven what came to be the regular FBI practice of perjury. In that case for the first time ever the government was able to examine in court a critic of the official mythology, me. In that it just pooped out and declined to continue that examination of me, that was no news, not to the papers that held all critics to be nuts.

To make the record for history clear and beyond question I regularly made myself subject to the penalties of perjury well aware of the fact that opposing counsel was the prosecutor who could and did file perjury cases for the government. Not once did any of the media mention either the unrefuted attribution of felonies to the FBI or the fact that an ordinary citizen had resorted to the

unusual means of making himself subject to the same charge and prosecution if he was not truthful in order to prove and dramatize that to frustrate and violated the law the government was resorting to felonies.

The law they were so determinedly violating with such regularity was the law that says the people have a right to know what their government does. That the FBI so consistently violated that law, that most American of laws, was never once news. It went unreported and the reporters boycotted virtually all of those many proceedings, at least 75 of them at the District court level alone.

That the courts, district and appeals, were utterly indifferent to proven charges of perjury also was not news. Nor was it reported that in doing this were complacent when faced with the denial of their supposedly precious Constitutional independence of the executive agencies.

In accepting perjury they were voluntarily surrendering their judicial independence, as I also alleged to them without their denial.

But they did it, fearing both the FBI and the consequences of compelling it to face those charges.

Not one of those courts ever rejected any one of the many sworn-to FBI affidavits and in fact, those same courts accepted those perjurious affidavits and on their basis often ruled for the government and against me, which meant against disclosure. And that meant for suppression of withheld government information about the assassination.

Many times, without it once being reported.

The more the FBI and its lawyers got away with it the more they resorted to perjury. In Case 78-0322 and 0420 combined, for the FBI's assassination records of its New Orleans and Dallas

offices, because Judge John Lewis Smith was known to be pretty much in the FBI's pocket, my unrefuted attribution of perjury to the FBI's case agent, John Phillips, was nonstop and was entirely ignored by Smith. I called this to the attention of The New York Times' Washington Bureau. Hedrick Smith, who then and later was also a star on TV "news" shows, particularly on public television, wrote me that he had consulted with a colleague and they had decided it as not newsworthy.

There is much else that I established in those FOIA lawsuits, not merely what I later wrote about but what the FBI said in some of those lawsuits, what the records it was forced to produce that it had kept secret said and meant. That was not news to any of the media. In this I limit myself to a few of the many possible illustrations relating to the vaulted FBI Laboratory only, and to what was absolutely essential evidence in the official mythological "solutions" to the crime.

Remember, as I had earlier brought to light, the FBI's and the Commission's "solutions" were in irreconcilable disagreement with each other. The FBI knew that the Commission's invention of the single bullet theory that was essential to its no-conspiracy "solution" was absolutely impossible. Yet when the best country's best shots were unable to duplicate the shooting attributed to Oswald, who was officially rated by the Marines as a "rather poor 'shot'," could not do what he allegedly did in three shots, admitting that there had been a fourth shot eliminated any chance at all of pulling of the hoax of a single assassin with more than three shots being admittedly fired during the assassination.

Knowing that the single-bullet theory of the Commission's was a practical impossibility, the FBI on its part just ignored the shot that missed. It had all three of the officially-admitted shots impacting.

That neither theory is tenable did not interest the media. Nor did it that these two bodies were in such basic disagreement and that if on that questions alone one was wrong, at least one obviously was wrong, at least one obviously was, then its "solution" should have been the cause of great controversy and concern. This was, after all, the assassination of a President.

But as the media was not interested at all in this most basic disagreement between them on the basic facts of the crime it also had no interest in the unquestionable fact that at least one of these two such trusted agencies was lying to the nation about the crime and about its investigations.

To put this more bluntly, by its total silence the media, which is supposed to tell the people what they need to know so our representative society can function as it should made itself the agency for covering up the fact that the government lied to us about the most subversive of crimes in a society like ours, the assassination of a President. Which means a *coup d'etat*.

If any bullet other than one and only one bullet the Commission and the FBI said the President's limousine, then on that basis alone there was another shot and another assassin. The specimen removed and tested by the FBI was identified in its Lab as Q15. That specimen no longer exists. It did not exist when the FBI, in secret, conducted neutron activation tests at Oak Ridge. There is no explanation offered by the FBI for its disappearance. While there can be an innocent explanation, the FBI presented none to the court or to me, and that, too, was not news. Special Agent Robert Frazier removed two specimens for testing from that magic bullet, Exhibit 99. He testified to the removal of one only to the Warren Commission. I got him to admit in the Garrison case against Clay Shaw by suggesting the question be asked to the Garrison lawyer, that in addition to the admitted removal of a sample from the bullet jacket, which was quite visible in the FBI pictures of it that the Commission used, he also removed a specimen of the bullet's core metal.

When we deposed him he made the same admission in his deposition testimony.

In withholding from the Commission the knowledge that he had removed that core sample Frazier made it easier for the Commission to perpetrate its fraudulent solution based on that single-bullet theory and for the Commission to claim that all the metal known to be missing from the bullet is metal it lost in its spectacular career that is so entirely unequaled in either science or mythology. And the FBI as well as the rest of the Johnson administration and the Commission very much wanted that no-conspiracy fraud that was disproved by the official evidence itself to succeed (CA ~~75-226~~).

When we deposed the lab spectrographer, ~~Special Agent~~ John F. Gallagher -- who was not asked to testify to the tests he personally performed by the Commission -- he testified that all the specimen needed for this test was of about a millimeter in size or of only virtual postage-stamp weight. But Frazier removed considerable more than that. When I got to examine and photograph that bullet at The National Archives, it was apparent that he had cut much more than was necessary out of the bullet. Questioned about this on deposition he offered no explanation of the need for removing more than necessary. In fact, he did ~~not~~ even need to use a knife as he visibly did ~~at all~~. He could have flaked off of the softer core material that is largely lead all that was needed with his fingernail. More than that much fell off itself, unaided, after the bullet was placed in the Archives.

Questioned about what happened to that excess metal, he said he did not know. Asked if he had weighed the specimens he removed, he testified that he had not. Asked why he said there was no need to. Asked what happened to the excess of metal he removed, he testified that he did not know.

What may or may not be an answer to this puzzle created by the FBI, why did it remove so much core material than the test required and then was unable to explain why it did or what

happened to it, is in the admission of the expert witness who made independent neutron activation analyses for the House Assassins committee. As reported earlier in this book, Dr. Vincent P. Guinn testified that none of the specimens supposedly from this same magic bullet left in the body of the second assassination victim, Texas Governor John B. Connally, matched its official description in either weight or shape and yet were identical on testing with the core of that magic bullet. An obvious possibility from Guinn's testimony is that the FBI substituted other specimens from what it knew was from the core of that bullet for those removed from Connally, using the excess Frazier removed from Bullet 399 for that purpose. That did tend to give credibility to the impossible career officially attributed to that magic bullet.

And that was absolutely indispensable to the official mythology that Oswald was the lone assassin and that his rifle fired all the bullets of the assassination shooting.

Although the FBI knew that a shot missed during the assassination and struck a curbstone at the opposite end of Dealey Plaza, a matter it in fact reported to the Commission according to its records produced in one of those FOIA lawsuits, in its five volume report it refers to no missed shot and in its accounting supposedly of all the shooting it admits to no missed shot. As I report in Post Mortem, Tom Dillard, then a Dallas Morning News photographer, was one of two professional photographers who took and published contemporaneously photographs of the hole in that curbstone made during the assassination shooting. After reading one of the innumerable leaks of what the Commission was going to conclude and it made no mention of that missed shot, Dillard told the Dallas United States Attorney Harold Barefoot Sanders about it. Thereafter the Commission could no longer follow the FBI's single-assassin lead and ignore the fact that a shot had missed.

Incredible for the Commission, as it should have been for the FBI, the wounding of James

T. Tague by the spray of concrete from the bullet hitting that curbstone was on the police radio in addition to being in the newspapers. The FBI transcribed the recordings of the police radio broadcasts for the Commission. ~~Yet~~ But the FBI has yet to admit that any bullet missed! ~~But~~ S the Dillard report to Sanders got to the Commission and it asked the FBI to investigate. The Dallas FBI reported it could find no such bullet hole or any other damage and suggested the weather or street-cleaning equipment could have wiped it out.

Street-cleaning equipment at the top of a curbstone, on the curve from vertical to horizontal? That is what the FBI reported and I published first in 1965.

If this were even possible then the cleaning of our city streets would eliminate their paved surfaces. This was the official FBI report on an FBI investigation. But it, too, was never news worth mentioning.

So the Commission, having little choice, asked the FBI to make a further investigation. It sent Lab photographic expert Special Agent Lyndal L. Shaneyfelt down. He had no trouble locating where the bullet hole had been. It was no longer there. He described what he saw as a smear rather than a hole. He photographed it and then had it dug up. He flew it back to Washington with him and in the Lab. Gallagher, supposedly subjected it to spectrographic analysis. They and I knew it had been patched, as quite visibly it was. I published the two contemporaneous photographs of which Dillard's was one and a photograph of the curbstone as it rests in the peace not even it should have in the Archives in Post Mortem (pages 608-609).

In the synopsis of the reports including the report on this that the Dallas assassination case agent, Robert P. Gemberling sent to FBIHQ, living with the second law of the FBI, cover your own ass (the first is cover the Bureau's ass) Gemberling wrote that there had been visible damage to the

curbstone Shaneyfelt and that taken "photographs" of the "location" to which he referred as where that "mark once appeared." this and other records relating to the curbstone were produced in CA 78-0322 and in CA 75-226.

The FBI lab proceeded with the ghastly charade of testing the patch, without ever reporting that it was a patch or that Oswald could not have made it because he was first in police custody and then himself killed. The Lab "tested" what it knew was patch as though it was caused by that missed shot -- the existence of which the FBI has never admitted.

In CA-75-226 I got what the FBI said was all the results, all the records of its testing of that alleged smear (some of which I published in Post Mortem on pages 453 ff). It made no formal report on this "analysis". In Gallagher's handwriting, is

> "Small foreign metal smears (see attached for location) were run spectrographically (Jarrell-Ash) and found to be essentially lead with a trace of antimony" (page 458).

(Jarrell-Ash is the kind of spectrographic examination he made).

His drawing of the "location" (which I published on the same page), shows it to be about an inch long by three-quarters of an inch. Gallagher also shows with an arrow what is presumed to be the path of the bullet and could not have been at was downward at a 33 degree angle from the right or from the west.

That meant that whatever caused it could not have been "fired" from the earth. There was only air 20 feet away, above the closest structure. The Triple Underpass bridge was 20 feet to the west of that location.

And Oswald was allegedly to the east, diagonally at the opposite end of Dealey Plaza, and a little more than 60 feet up, on the building's sixth floor. So on both counts whatever it was could

not have been cause by Oswald.

(By later scientific examination of that alleged smear published in Case Open on pages 142-143 I was able to prove that concrete paste had been used to fill up the bullet hole on that concrete curbstone. And that also was not news).

The FBI was to have produced the film made when the flame used in spectrographic analysis was photographed. It did not. When forced by my demand for an explanation, it presented third-hand hearsay rather than an affidavit. It told Pratt that it had been told by a former agent who had retired to Florida that he had been told by he did not recall whom that the photograph of that flame was destroyed -- to save space!

One only of all the thin pictures of the spectrographic-test flame was destroyed "to save space" in the enormity of the FBI's files? And when that destruction was strictly forbidden without the agreement of the Archivist of the United States?

But the Pratt who threatened Lesar and me when we proved that Kilty had perjured himself, about which Pratt did nothing else at all, was satisfied with this totally incompetent, as courts regard competence, non-explanation of why the FBI alleged got rid of that quintessential evidence. News? Of course not!

If that examination did not establish that whatever caused whatever was there was caused by an Oswald bullet that alone meant there was another assassin, whether or not Oswald was one. And that alone proved there had been a conspiracy. But the sainted FBI founding director had ordained before there was any investigation that Oswald was the one and only assassin. So, when I demanded the Lab record it was memory holed and with it disappeared that disproof of the official mythology. Thus, as the court records in that lawsuit establish, the FBI destroyed the evidence required to prove

that it was a bullet from Oswald's rifle that caused the damage to that curbstone. Because as the FBI knew only too well, its spectrographic test prove the opposite, if it had delivered that picture of the flame or any copy of it I could have had it subjected to spectrographic analysis and proven the known falsity of the official "solutions" to the assassination.

What was delivered to me in that lawsuit include Gallagher's test results of other of the bullet specimens he tested. One of them in tabular form identifies 11 different components of those bullets. (Published, also in facsimile, in Post Mortem on page 449). It is the FBI's knowingly false official conjecture that it was only the core of the bullet that somehow, after shedding its casing or hardened jacket, hit that innocent curbstone that is now part of our country's corrupted history. Gallagher in other tests identified nine components of that alleged core.

But his testing of the patched curbstone that they all knew had been patched he detected from his own notes, there being no report, only two of those nine elements. And they are common in many uses.

A copy of Gallagher's alleged notes on other of his alleged testing was also delivered to me in CA 78-0322. FBIHQ had sent it to its Dallas office, its "office of origin" in the JFK assassination. Frazier annotated what he got from Gallagher. Applying his expertise as a firearms examiner in his almost illegible notes, true to the second law of the FBI, covering his own ass, he says that what Gallagher tested could have been caused by "an automobile wheel weight." He did not testify to that before the Warren Commission when he testified on this matter as the FBI's expert.

What all this was kept secret until I filed those lawsuits means is that in order to preserve the knowingly false "solution" to the assassination the FBI testified with knowing falsehood about what caused what it knew did not begin as a mere "smear" and what it knew began as the hole made by

a bullet fired during the assassination. The FBI knew that someone, when Oswald could not have done it, patched that bullet impact mark so the FBI could not lift and test traces from it because those traces would not and could not have been of any bullet fired by Oswald.

In plain English, the FBI lied deliberately to prevent the solution to that awful crime.

But none of this, all yielded and public in those two FOIA lawsuits, was news to the media.

When we deposed Frazier I showed him a Lab photograph of the front of the President's shirt collar, a photograph it had not given the Commission. I got it from Richard Kleindinest when FOIA requests were addressed to the Deputy Attorney General of the United States, which he then was. He asked the FBI to show him the pictures I requested and seeing nothing secret in them he merely put those FBI original pictures in an envelope and mailed them to me.

The Commission's solution that it knew was both false and impossible is that the first of the three shots it admitted were fired during the assassination hit the President at the base of his neck in the back, exited through the front, through the shirt collar and tie, then struck Governor Connally under his right armpit, exiting near his right nipple on his breast after smashing four inches of his fifth rib, then demolished the heavy bones of Connally's right wrist, thereafter sneaking into his left thigh and lurking there until with more of that fabulous magic it knew exactly when to work its way out, onto the mattress of a hospital gurney, whence it somehow got under that mattress and with the remarkable intelligence it had already demonstrated knew exactly when to fall out from underneath the mattress just when it would be seen by Hospital Engineer Darrell Tomlinson. And from that remarkable career it allegedly emerged virtually entirely unscratched.

The FBI knew it could not make that bull stick, thus it opted instead not to admit that any bullet had missed. Its official explanation of the shooting is that the first and third shots hit Kennedy

only, the third being the fatal shot, and the second hit Connally alone.

We showed Frazier the FBI's own picture of that shirt collar (published in Post Mortem on page 598). He admitted that when he saw the shirt collar itself he had questions about the damage to it he saw. As depicted in this FBI photograph what was supposed to be the bullet holes through both halves of the front of the collar bands where they overlap do not coincide in their positions on it and are not even of the same length.

So there is no mystery about this, I established that the damage to the shirt collar was caused by a scalpel used by the nurses in the emergency procedures in the emergency room when there is no time to untie the tie. The tie was cut off at the knot, leaving a slight knick in it and making those slits, not bullet holes, in the collarband. Moreover, as I also brought to light, along with I report about the cause of those slits in Post Mortem, the only doctor who saw the President before any of his clothing was removed, Dr. Charles Carrico, twice testified to the Commission, when asked, that the bullet hole was in the front of his neck, above the President's collar.

Knowing the official mythology was impossible and that this alone proved it was impossible, covering his own ass Frazier testified that he had directed that an examination of the collar and tie be made by a Lab hair and fiber expert, Paul M. Stombaugh.

It should by now be no surprise that the FBI produced no such hair-and-fibers examination report in that lawsuits, as the record reflects. Instead it gave me a brief report by Frazier himself made on his first glimpse of that shirt, a report so casual and inadequate it makes no reference to his directing the hair-and fibers examination.

The court record, all public, again established that the crime was not solved, was not officially intended to be solved and that at the very least the FBI and many of its agents knew they

were perpetrating a fraud as a solution to the "crime of the century."

Was it -- any of it -- news?

Of course not, ninny! If it had been news would not the media have reported it?

Well, it wasn't mentioned. So that means, obviously, that none of this had no news value.

I provide one other of the facts developed in those lawsuits that was never reported by an by any of the media. I am certain that what I say is true of the King assassination. I believe it is also true of the JFK assassination. A records search to confirm my recollection is not now possible for me.

A standard, basic police test in any case in which a pistol or rifle was fired is to make a swab test. It is impossible to conceive of a less complicated or less expensive test. In it a piece of fabric, usually cotton, is forced through the barrel to determine if the weapon was fired after its last cleaning. If it was not fired and if oil was used, as it usually is in a cleaning, oil will show on that patch. If the weapon was fired, then byproducts of the firing are picked up by the patch and no oil is. In the King case the Department of Justice appeals officer confirmed what I told that court, that no such test was made of the rifle that was said to have fired the bullet that killed King. In the other FBI testing in that case it did a swab test even on a rifle it knew had not been fired because it was new and the encrustation of the preservative used, cosmoline, prevented the rifle from being fired.

It did not swab test the one and only rifle it claimed had killed King but it <u>did</u> swab test a rifle it knew could not have been fired!

It is my recollection that there was no such swab test on the alleged Oswald rifle.

I was supposedly stored in his blanket and it was "well oiled" when it reached the FBI Lab. It supposedly was carried to the assassination by Oswald in a home-made paper bag. The FBI's

testing of the blanket and that bag revealed that neither had the slightest trace of oil on it (CA 75-226).

These foregoing illustrations are only some of those that one would ordinarily believe would be regarded as newsworthy, especially when the tests related to the assassination of a President, the most subversive of crimes in a society like ours. None of this was news when it developed in and from those lawsuits and was all public. Some was in the Commission's public record.

None of the media ever asked to examine the records I got in those lawsuits and none of the media to whose attention I called these things ever reported any of them.

This and so much more like it was not news.

But to the Post the La Fontaine's fantasy of the "The Fourth Tramp" was worth more space in its Outlook section than it had ever given any article.

With this background, with this provided for understanding what is not news to the media, the Post included, the reader will be better able to evaluate its judgment in publishing that La Fontaine theory that Oswald was a snitch.

It does, I believe, portray one aspect -- the role of the media in the JFK assassination industry. The media made this industry possible by its abdications in particular, by its departure from traditional reporting and traditional concepts of what is news.

Most if not all of the major media today have fact checkers. My experience with them is that they are bright, young, energetic, diligent and more than merely competent. My experience with the Post's is that all of the above applies.

Yet obviously it did not check the La Fontaines out. The defense the Post Outlook staffer wrote me is that those it had asked did not object to publication of that malarkey. That is not the

testing of the blanket and that bag revealed that neither had the slightest trace of oil on it (CA 75-226).

These foregoing illustrations are only some of those that one would ordinarily believe would be regarded as newsworthy, especially when the tests related to the assassination of a President, the most subversive of crimes in a society like ours. None of this was news when it developed in and from those lawsuits and was all public. Some was in the Commission's public record.

None of the media ever asked to examine the records I got in those lawsuits and none of the media to whose attention I called these things ever reported any of them.

This and so much more like it was not news.

But to the Post the La Fontaine's fantasy of the "The Fourth Tramp" was worth more space in its Outlook section than it had ever given any article.

With this background, with this provided for understanding what is not news to the media, the Post included, the reader will be better able to evaluate its judgment in publishing that La Fontaine theory that Oswald was a snitch.

It does, I believe, portray one aspect -- the role of the media in the JFK assassination industry. The media made this industry possible by its abdications in particular, by its departure from traditional reporting and traditional concepts of what is news.

Most if not all of the major media today have fact checkers. My experience with them is that they are bright, young, energetic, diligent and more than merely competent. My experience with the Post's is that all of the above applies.

Yet obviously it did not check the La Fontaines out. The defense the Post Outlook staffer wrote me is that those it had asked did not object to publication of that malarkey. That is not the

same as saying it stacked and asking that opinion begs the question of accuracy and dependability. Even the question of reasonableness. Why only the Outlook editor can say. I reflect above what only some of the relevant disclosed FBI records show. On fact no other checking was necessary. And all I cite and quote above was disclosed to me by the FBI and is publicly available in its public reading room, or is in the Commission's public record.

When it is so well known at the Post that I make all I have freely available and respond to all questions I can answer, and the Post has asked them of me for 30 years, why it asked me nothing about this La Fontaine supermarket-tabloid journalism I do not know. The most obvious of the possible explanations is that those anxious for the story to appear in the Post believed its appearance to be more important than its accuracy or its truthfulness or its relevance to the assassination.

The La Fontaines depend on the computer wizardry of Bill Adams, from their own account. A phone call to Adams would have disclosed immediately that all his alleged FOIA accomplishments are separate from any interest in the JFK assassination. From his own account of the thrust of his inquiry, which he distributed as soon as he heard there was criticism of the La Fontaine article, it centered on gunrunning. No relationship of that with the JFK assassination has yet been shown, other than the non-relationship of the La Fontaine pretenses that have no basis in fact.

The La Fontaine basis for alleging that Oswald was jailed with the other men of their flights of fancy? Rather than fact for this their computer genius himself described that nonsense as "my interpretation." He uses the same words to try to validate the misrepresentation of the FBI Elrod document, and he refers to but a single one. Of it he says "my interpretation" of it "is much stronger" than stated in the article.

On Oswald allegedly seeing the man with the bashed-up face, "my interpretation is that Miller was purposefully brought to the hall in front of the cell for Oswald to ID."

His computer-enhanced reputation is based on a physical impossibility that no computer or "interpretation" can overcome: Oswald's cell was not on that "hall." He was in the maximum security cell.

This Adams defense was sent me by my friend Dave Perry. He is a professional investigator living near Dallas. He got it from Adams August 13. In the article he wrote in response to Adams' Perry reports what I am confident the La Fontaines kept secret from the Post, which would not have considered publishing any version of what the La Fontaines had aired on a TV version of the supermarket tabloids, Hard Copy, almost a year earlier, on November 16, a time for assassination-anniversary commercializing. That was a "watered-down" version of what they gave the Post.

What Elrod then said includes, "I never told them [the FBI] anything about guns, gangsters or Ruby." This is hardly what the La Fontaines gave the Post and it published.

Dave went back to the Dallas Morning News account of the arrest of those with a convertible allegedly overflowing with stolen weapons. It says there were merely five weapons in that car. Hardly a car full of them. And hardly the kind of heist that requires or justifies five co-conspirators.

Along with these substantial questions about the dependability of the La Fontaines and their supermarket journalism to exploit and commercialize the assassination there was what there always is, a question about their record. Perry wrote on one significant if not spectacular item in the in assassination journalism past:

> "Several years ago the La Fontaines were convinced the assassin was Roscoe White. On November 26, 1990, during a phone conversation with Mary, she reported she had partial proof. She indicated she had a police report showing Roscoe White made an arrest before he was on the police force. I told her I couldn't figure the connection. Mary Replied, 'its very complex. We'll probably release the information

very soon.'"

"Very soon" meant not in the four years that passed to the time of this writing.

As Dave wrote, the La Fontaines were convinced of the genuineness of the most ~~palpable~~ outrageous and impossible of the indecent inventions to make money from the assassination. It was by, or at least in the name of that most loving of sons, Rickey White. His father, Roscoe, had for a short period of time been a Dallas policeman. The Rickey White story is that his father was a double assassin, that he killed both the President and J.D. Tippit -- while he was on duty as a Dallas policeman. And with Oswald in the car when Roscoe, not Oswald, killed Tippit.

That scenario was quite familiar to me. I have the novel from which it was cribbed. (In that novel, JFK survived.)

Roscoe's duty assignment for that day, later referred to by the police, placed him away from both killings and left no possibility of his being at either scene. But that the La Fontaines did not check.

Other details of the Rickey White fabrication also disproved it immediately. He said, for example, that his and the Tippit family were close and lived across the street from each other. They never did and the Dallas phone book for 1963 discloses that they then did not.

But they Rickey has his eye on Oliver Stone's money. Stone had just announced he'd be making his assassination movie that appeared as JFK. Stone did not go for White's made-up history. Nor did Viking or any other publisher, the hired ghost having proposed the obvious fake book to Viking.

All that was true in this White concoction is that Roscoe, his father, had been a policeman for a short period of time. Even the account of Roscoe's death is fabricated so it can be attributed

to the CIA for which he allegedly worked. Those who made this story up also made evidence up. Those manufactures include assassination messages allegedly sent Roscoe by the CIA. They are obvious fakes.

But the La Fontaines were much attracted to that fabrication is their own evaluation of their journalistic judgment and dependability. I doubt if their attachment to this White fabrication would have encouraged the Post to publish their "Fourth Tramp" fiction if the Post had known about it.

When where Oswald was jailed, what cell he was in and where in the jail it was is so important to the La Fontaine commercialization and exploitations published by the Post and slated to become a book, I did what they could have done easily. I consulted a man who on the Dallas police was involved with Oswald when he was moved from the cell in which he was confined and taken to be questioned, retired detective James R. Leavelle. Jim is the other central figure in the most widely and often-published picture of Oswald. Oswald was handcuffed to him when, after the last police questioning to which Jim took him, he was taking Oswald to the car that was to shift him to the sheriff's detention. This and his wife Taimi and my wife and I developed a friendly relationship. He has spent hours going over records I have and made copies of those he wanted. When they left they had a wide selection of perennial flowers for their daughter's garden about an hour by car from our home. So, I wrote and asked Jim about how and where Oswald was jailed. In his reply to me (what I did not know, that he had been questioned about that by the FBI. Jim said he told them that "at least three policemen took turns guarding his cell in the F-Block ... T.V. Todd, J.L. Popplewell and Buel T. Beddingfield." So, there was always a policeman outside the Oswald cell, F2, in which, Jim said, he was always alone and that the two other maximum-security cells then were emptied so that Oswald was always alone in the middle cell of the three in that maximum-security block and

always under police guard.

Jim also made and sent me "a hand drawn diagram as I remember it having worked in the jail for several months many years before. The F Block was built so that anyone there could not see or talk to anyone else. There were steel walls around it, as indicated by the heavy lines in the diagram.

His drawing does indicate the extra steel thickness of the walls around those three cells that made hearing through impossible.

That block was off the main corridor. It was not on the "hall" in the La Fontaine and Adams fiction and it was not possible to march anyone past it for Oswald to "ID" without that being remarkably conspicuous.

Jim then wrote me that there was a chair for the policeman on guard outside of the third of those three maximum-security cells in which Oswald was in the middle one.

In short, there is not a single thing that stacks and is relevant to the assassination or to Oswald in all the long La Fontaine story to which the Post gave this extraordinary space and attention.

As with normal, simple inquiry the Post would have learned if it had made the normal checking of fact for which it is well staffed. Why the Post did no checking is when I sent it and appears as the preceding chapter.

The Outlook staffer who was so critical of me and what I wrote had told me that among those who read the article and did not oppose its publication is George Lardner. I did not phone George to ask him because he is on sabbatical working on a very difficult and painful book. It is on the killing of his daughter by a man who should not have been in a position to hurt anyone, a man who

was able to kill her only because the institutions all failed. He won a 1992 Pulitzer for his Post article on it, for Outlook. I was certain George would not have liked the La Fontaine piece so for both reasons, especially not to intrude on his writing, I did not phone him.

But my friend, Gary Mack, did. Gary is also a friend of Dave Perry. Gary is the archivist of the Dallas County Historical Society's conversion of the "Sixth Floor," which it is called, of the old TSBD building into a museum. Gary wrote me that, "George Lardner told me that the Post ran their piece by him and he vetoed it; however, some other Post staffers found it interesting and thought it would be fun to run and see what would happen."

So, knowing George well now for some 30 years and knowing how conservative his approach and thinking are, he reacted as I'd assumed he would and despite his opposing publication of the La Fontaine article, the Post did no checking of it at all. Not even after the negative reaction of its in-house assassination expert.

It was easier for the Post to decide to run this article because like so much writing of that time, for example the Posner and Riebling overt dishonesties, it does not question the official assassination mythology.

Even if Oswald had been a police snitch that had nothing at all to do with the assassination.

I read the Post daily. I liked the old Post, when Eugene Meyer ran it, and when I worked on the Wilmington Morning News I subscribed to it. I've read it regularly now for some 60 years. I have been particularly interested in what it reported on the assassinations. In more than 30 years I remember only one Post article in which it took issue with the official mythology. That was written by George Lardner, based on information I gave him. In it he and the Post acknowledged that the assassination had been the end product of a conspiracy. But the La Fontaine article does not say this.

It does not question any of the official mythology. After that publication the Post printed one letter disagreeing with it. That letter was from the head of the Dallas FBI office.

One aspect of this, why the Post did not checking and why it published the article at all, is consistent with the record of all the major media -- a record of deprecation of even seeming criticism of the official mythology. The Post's publication of the La Fontaine trash is consistent with the editorial policy it shares with all the major media, the policy of deprecating anything that appears to be critical of the official assassination mythology.

In their account of Oswald's life and of his imprisonment neither the FBI nor the Warren Commission referred to his as a police snitch, for example. Or to his being jailed in the same cell with men of proven criminal history and potential for violence. So, to casual reading, this trash may appear to question the official mythology. In fact it does not and in fact, to those mature and sophisticated leaders in the government and in the Congress, those who can on reading it immediately discount what the La Fontaines wrote, their predisposition in support of the official mythology and against any criticism of it was fortified by the La Fontaine article.

Almost never does any part of the major media present any solid, substantial questioning of the official story. It has become the fad, as exemplified by Posner, to disagree with parts of what the government said, but when it does that it never, ever questions the basic conclusion.

In effect it is now almost universal editorial policy to acknowledge that in varying degrees the Commission was wrong but that despite being so often so wrong -- and in some versions it was wrong about almost everything -- it nonetheless blundered through the right conclusions.

Witness the universal adulation of Posner for his pap that disagrees with the official account of the shooting and yet says the Commission was right in concluding that Oswald was nonetheless

the lone assassin.

Whether or not the Post found publishing the La Fontaine commercialization and exploitation of the assassination -- and whatever they may have had in mind it is no better than that -- to be "fun" or "interesting", and regardless of whether those words are Lardner's or Gary Mack's, for a major paper to publish it and then to give it such extraordinary attention was a major disservice to the truth about the assassination and to the country and its painful history.

It was, at best, irresponsible.

And when that kind of mindless trash is published and nothing else is, it has the effect, whether or not that was the Post's intention, of representing it as typical of all disagreements of any form or content with the official assassination mythology.